DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 735 CE 057 218

AUTHOR Silvanik, Robert A.
TITLE Toward Integrated Adult Learning Systems: The Status of State Literacy Efforts.
INSTITUTION National Governors' Association, Washington, DC. Center for Policy Research.
SPONS AGENCY Gannett Foundation, Arlington, VA.; John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Chicago, IL.
REPORT NO ISBN-1-55877-087-9
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 63p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; Cooperative Programs; Educational Planning; *Literacy Education; *Program Implementation; *Program Improvement; State Government; *State Programs; *State Standards

ABSTRACT

Information was collected about the current status of state literacy and basic skills efforts through a comprehensive survey of state literacy initiatives conducted in the summer of 1990. A total of 390 responses were received from the more than 400 surveys sent to governors' offices, state agencies, and Statewide literacy organizations. Results of the survey were reported under two broad themes: state leadership for literacy and state strategies for literacy. According to the survey results, 40 states have a state-level coalition, council, or similar entity that serves, at a minimum, as a coordinating mechanism for literacy-providing agencies and organizations. However, in most cases, their scope of activity does not extend far beyond public awareness. Where strong leadership for literacy exists, it usually consists of some combination of sources, such as the governor's office, a state agency, the state legislature, or the volunteer or private sectors. A review of strategy implementation showed that few states have accurately determined the problem, about one-third of the states have established some type of state-level performance expectations for literacy services, and 16 states have implemented some type of systematic mechanism to foster business and/or union involvement in adult literacy. The study concluded that some states have begun to bring coherence to the fragmented array of programs and providers that make up the current delivery system for adult literacy; however, much work remains to be done. Recommendations were made in the areas of state leadership, assessment, performance expectations, accountability, professional development, and promotion of experiential and self-directed learning. (Appendices include survey instruments, summary of respondents, and selected aggregate responses.) (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED329735

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Y Bond

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE057218

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Toward Integrated Adult Learning Systems: The Status of State Literacy Efforts

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION

State Policy Reports

Human Resources Policy Studies

Training and Employment Program

by Robert A. Silvanik

State Literacy Exchange
Center for Policy Research

National Governors' Association

The National Governors' Association, founded in 1908 as the National Governors' Conference, is the instrument through which the nation's Governors collectively influence the development and implementation of national policy and apply creative leadership to state issues. The association's members are the Governors of the fifty states, the commonwealths of the Northern Mariana Islands and Puerto Rico, and the territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. The association has seven standing committees on major issues: Agriculture and Rural Development; Economic Development and Technological Innovation; Energy and Environment; Human Resources; International Trade and Foreign Relations; Justice and Public Safety; and Transportation, Commerce, and Communications. Subcommittees and task forces that focus on principal concerns of the Governors operate within this framework.

The association works closely with the administration and Congress on state-federal policy issues through its offices in the Hall of the States in Washington, D.C. The association serves as a vehicle for sharing knowledge of innovative programs among the states and provides technical assistance and consultant services to Governors on a wide range of management and policy issues.

The Center for Policy Research is the research and development arm of NGA. The center is a vehicle for sharing knowledge about innovative state activities, exploring the impact of federal initiatives on state government, and providing technical assistance to states. The center works in a number of policy fields, including agriculture, economic development, education, environment, health, social services, training and employment, trade, and transportation.

ISBN 1-55877-087-9

© 1991 by the National Governors' Association
444 North Capitol Street
Washington, D.C. 20001-1572

Support for this publication was provided by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the Gannett Foundation.

The responsibility for the accuracy of the analysis and for the judgments expressed lies with the author. The report does not constitute policy positions of the National Governors' Association, individual Governors, or the sponsors.

Printed in the United States of America.

Contents

Acknowledgements	v
Executive Summary	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
THE STATUS OF STATE LITERACY EFFORTS	3
STATE LEADERSHIP FOR ADULT LITERACY	7
A State-Level Coordinating Mechanism for Literacy	7
Leadership for a State Literacy Infrastructure	9
STATE STRATEGIES FOR LITERACY	17
Determining the Dimensions of the Literacy Problem	17
Setting Priorities and Performance Expectations for Literacy Services	19
Establishing State-Level Performance Standards and Quality Measures for Adult Literacy Programs	22
Expanding Opportunities for Experiential Learning and Promoting Contextual Literacy Programs	23
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATE ACTION	29
Appendix A: Survey Instruments	33
Appendix B: Survey Respondents	49
Appendix C: Selected Aggregate Survey Responses	55

Acknowledgements

The National Governors' Association (NGA) established the State Literacy Exchange late in 1989 to provide information and assistance to states in their efforts to improve the provision of adult literacy and basic skills services. The literacy exchange serves Governors, Governors' staff, and state-level and statewide leaders in the adult literacy and basic skills field. Much of its activity focuses on supporting states in the development and implementation of strategies for building a state literacy infrastructure with the goal of creating integrated adult learning systems at the state level.

The State Literacy Exchange is supported by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the Gannett Foundation. Housed in the Training and Employment Program of NGA's Center for Policy Research, the literacy exchange relies on the expertise and guidance of a six-member national advisory committee. The advisory committee members are:

- Julie Mabus, First Lady of Mississippi;
- Garrett Murphy, Director of Continuing Education Programs, state of New York;
- Gary Patureau, Director of the Governor's Office of Literacy, state of Louisiana;
- Simon Roberts, Director of Adult Education for Black Hawk College, state of Illinois;
- Juanita Stanley, Executive Director of California Literacy, Inc., state of California; and
- Sondra Stein, Director of the Commonwealth Literacy Campaign, state of Massachusetts.

This report is based on a comprehensive survey of more than 400 state literacy leaders on the status of state literacy initiatives. The survey was conducted during the summer of 1990. The State Literacy Exchange continues to update information on state-level literacy activities.

Special thanks are extended to the individuals who completed and returned the survey instruments. Members of the State Literacy Exchange Advisory Committee, and Karl Haigler, Special Advisor to the Governor of Mississippi, provided invaluable advice and assistance.

Several individuals at the National Governors' Association made substantial contributions. Robert A. Silvanik, director of the State Literacy Exchange, researched and wrote the report. Evelyn Ganzglass, director of the Training and Employment Program, commented extensively on early drafts of the manuscript. Gerry Feinstein and Karen Glass, of the Office of Public Affairs, provided editorial and production assistance. Francine Matthews and Debbie Woods provided secretarial support.

Executive Summary

Overview

This report focuses on the current status of state literacy and basic skills efforts based on information collected through a comprehensive survey of state literacy initiatives conducted in the summer of 1990. The survey is especially timely in light of the national goal for adult literacy and lifelong learning adopted by the nation's Governors and endorsed by the President. The nation has ten years to achieve this goal. To do so, states must develop and implement well-coordinated and efficiently operated adult learning systems to ensure that accessible and high-quality services are available to those who need and want them. Work must begin immediately.

Descriptions and conclusions about the current status of state literacy efforts are based on survey forms returned by Governors' offices, state agencies, and statewide literacy organizations, though the information may not represent a complete picture of state-level literacy activities. The report is structured around two broad themes: state leadership for literacy and state strategies for literacy.

State Leadership for Literacy

According to the survey results, forty states have a state-level coalition, council, commission, partnership, or other similarly named entity that serves, at a minimum, as a coordinating mechanism for literacy-providing agencies and organizations. However, in most cases, their scope of activity does not extend far beyond public awareness, and rarely does their membership include all relevant service providers.

Notwithstanding a state-level coordinating mechanism, strong and committed leadership is required for building a state literacy infrastructure. This leadership can originate from the Governor's office, a state agency, the state legislature, or the volunteer or private sectors. Where it exists, this leadership usually consists of some combination of these sources, which vary in each state.

Governors in eighteen states have promoted literacy in at least one of four ways. Six states have offices for literacy under the auspices of the Governor's office. A coordinating mechanism for literacy falls under the authority of the Governor's office in ten states. In eight states, a gubernatorial literacy initiative currently exists. Five Governors have specifically earmarked federal discretionary funds to literacy activities.

In a number of states the legislature has also taken action in adult literacy. Thirty states reported enacting literacy-specific legislation during the last four years. Such legislation typically appropriates state funds for literacy programs or authorizes a new state office or agency for adult literacy. In most cases the leadership provided by the state legislature supplements other sources of leadership from the Governor's office, a state agency, or the volunteer or private sectors.

Some states rely on other state-level agencies or statewide organizations for leadership. Most often, this leadership resides with the state division of adult education or a state-level commission or task force for literacy. In these states, garnering the support and involvement of the Governor's office and/or the state legislature becomes an important endeavor.

State Strategies for Literacy

Seven strategies for developing an infrastructure for literacy to ensure an integrated adult learning system were outlined in a 1990 report published by the National Governors' Association, *Educating America: State Strategies for Achieving the National Education Goals*. Prepared by NGA's Task Force on Education, the strategies are:

- Determine the dimensions of the problem;
- Set priorities and performance expectations;
- Create accountability systems;
- Establish comprehensive credentialing systems;
- Promote professional development;
- Expand opportunities for experiential learning, and increase the range of settings in which learning occurs; and
- Promote self-directed learning and consumer choice.

Determining the dimensions of the literacy problem in a given state is a critical first step in addressing the problem. However, accurate and reliable state-specific literacy assessments are rare. Many states base literacy problem estimates on Census data, though this information has serious weaknesses for measuring the impact of programs over time. Hawaii and Puerto Rico have made attempts to move beyond this approach, and Mississippi and Oregon have conducted state assessments using the assessment instrument developed by the Educational Testing Service for the U.S. Department of Labor.

According to the survey, about one-third of the states have established some type of state-level performance expectations for literacy services. These performance expectations are of two types: broad outcome goals for statewide progress and "process" goals related to program and system objectives. Seven states have set broad outcome goals for literacy that are similar to the national adult literacy and lifelong learning adopted by the Governors and endorsed by the President. Twelve states have established statewide process goals that are directly related to system or program objectives such as expanding the number of literacy programs, increasing enrollments in literacy programs, or developing local literacy coalitions.

Fourteen states have established state-level performance standards or quality measures for adult literacy programs. Eleven of these states have client-related performance standards (i.e., standards established for participants in specific programs such as JTPA, JOBS, or adult basic education). The other three states have established quality program measures for use across delivery systems.

According to the survey, sixteen states have implemented some type of "systematic mechanism to foster business and/or union involvement" in adult literacy and basic skills programs. Some states have established a new coordinating mechanism (office or agency) at the state level for workplace or workforce education, while others have implemented specific program initiatives. In addition, Mississippi is the first state to offer businesses a tax credit against state income taxes to provide basic skills instruction to their employees. A smaller number of states have developed statewide family literacy efforts or targeted services to welfare recipients by enhancing literacy and basic skills services in their welfare-to-work program.

Conclusions

The survey findings attest to the fact that some states have begun to bring coherence to the fragmented array of programs and providers that make up the current delivery system for adult literacy and basic skills services. However, much work remains to be done.

Only a few states have implemented an assessment mechanism that accurately and reliably measures the literacy abilities of their citizens or state progress toward the national literacy and lifelong learning goal. Little progress has been made in developing statewide priorities or performance expectations for state adult literacy services. Most states have not developed a common set of program-related performance standards across publicly funded adult literacy programs. And only about one-third of the states have implemented systematic statewide workplace or workforce education initiatives. In addition, state activity related to building a state infrastructure generally has not focused on establishing comprehensive credentialing systems or professional development programs across delivery systems or on promoting self-directed learning or consumer choice for users of the system. In short, no state has yet to develop an integrated adult learning system that provides accessible and high-quality services to all who need them.

In adopting the national goal on literacy and lifelong learning, the Governors have recognized the urgency of improving the literacy skills of the adult population. Achieving a literate citizenry by the year 2000 will require strong state leadership committed to the development of a state literacy infrastructure based on the seven strategies. The following recommendations for state action lay out a plan for implementation of an integrated state adult learning system.

Recommendations:

States should demonstrate strong leadership and bring together key literacy leaders to secure the necessary commitment to building a state infrastructure for adult literacy and basic skills.

States should determine the dimensions of their literacy problem by conducting an accurate and reliable assessment of the literacy and basic skills abilities of the adult population.

States should set priorities and performance expectations for all publicly financed literacy services, and encourage the private and nonprofit sectors to commit to these priorities and performance expectations.

States should create accountability systems for all providers that establish clear performance standards and ensure quality programs.

States should establish comprehensive credentialing systems based on a competency-based approach to skill certification, which begins in school and continues through lifelong learning systems.

States should promote professional development to upgrade the quality of instructors in the adult learning system.

States should expand opportunities for experiential learning, and increase the range of settings in which learning occurs.

States should promote self-directed learning and consumer choice.

1. Introduction

The need for systematic collection of information on literacy efforts has grown with burgeoning public and private sector activities. Although numerous organizations monitor developments in the field, most information is anecdotal and necessarily incomplete. The State Literacy Exchange housed at NGA undertook a comprehensive survey of more than 400 state literacy contacts during the summer of 1990 to systematically collect information on state literacy initiatives. The survey results do not fill all of the information gaps. However, the findings will improve the available information base and can help inform policymaking decisions at the federal, state, and local levels.

The focus of this report is state-level activities in adult literacy. Three different types of survey instruments were used, and at least one response was received from forty-nine states, the commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia. The findings presented and the conclusions drawn in this report are primarily based on responses to Governors' offices forms and state agency/state-level organization general information forms. Governors' offices forms were returned by twenty-six states. State agency/state-level organization general information forms were returned by thirty-three adult education agencies, twenty-three correction education offices, twenty JTPA agencies, twenty-three JOBS offices, twenty-five state libraries, and forty-three other statewide literary organizations.

Information from individual states may not be included if appropriate surveys were not returned and, therefore, may not represent a complete picture of state-level literacy activities. In any case, the information should not suggest any relative ranking among states on the current status of their literacy efforts. A detailed description of the survey instruments and a list of agency and organization respondents can be found in Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively. Appendix C contains selected aggregate responses, by state, to NGA's Survey of State Literacy Initiatives.

States vary considerably in the comprehensiveness of their literacy efforts. However, it is fair to say that no state has developed a systematic policy and management framework to guide and improve the quality of its adult learning system. A description of findings and an analysis of survey results can facilitate progress in all states toward achieving an integrated adult learning system.

2. The Status of State Literacy Efforts

Much of the discussion and debate in recent years on the status of the education system in the United States has focused on problems affecting the K - 12 public school system. However, this country faces another education crisis that has serious implications for its social well-being and economic future—the absence of integrated adult learning systems. Although statistics are "soft" on the adult literacy and basic skills problem, current estimates of the number of functionally illiterate adults in the United States range from 23 million to 70 million. Other data indicate that functional illiteracy costs this country more than $220 billion annually in social welfare programs, remedial education, job incompetence, crime, and lost taxes. Still other projections reveal that by the year 2000, 75 percent of all jobs will require education beyond the ninth grade, 75 percent of the current workforce will still be in the workforce, and roughly 30 million current workers will need skills upgrading.

Recognizing the urgency of this problem, in early 1990 the nation's Governors and the President included a goal on adult literacy and lifelong learning among their six national education goals:

> By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

Just as this goal implies a broad concept of adult literacy, so too must states structure a comprehensive response to the problem. Adult literacy means more than the ability to read and write. It takes into account the skills and abilities needed for individuals to pursue personal objectives and realize their fullest potential. Adult learning systems must emphasize the concept of lifelong learning. Therefore, the objectives of the national goal include a strengthened connection between education and work, better workforce education and training opportunities, appropriate programs for part-time and mid-career workers, and improved student attainment at the postsecondary level.

Yet, the fragmented system that exists today to educate adults is a patchwork of public and private programs that usually operate in isolation from each other. These programs are funded by federal, state, and/or private sources, they are governed by myriad rules and regulations, and they are targeted to different clients. Moreover, states vary widely in their level of support for adult literacy and basic skills programs. As a result, this system fails to serve large numbers of people who need services. It does not provide sufficient opportunities for adults to learn the applied and conceptual skills they need to function effectively in society.

Achieving the national goal on adult literacy and lifelong learning will require well-coordinated and efficiently operated adult learning systems in all states. A more coherent system is needed to ensure that accessible and high-quality services are available to enable individuals to fulfill their lifelong learning pursuits, regardless of their motives. This will require better integration of the policies and management processes of state education, employment and training, welfare, economic development, and library agencies and those of volunteer, private, and other organizations. Ultimately, an integrated learning system will enable adult learners to apply literacy and basic skills instruction to the tasks of responsible citizenship, productive employment, or further learning.

In recent years, interest and initiatives in adult literacy have increased significantly, with much of the activity occurring at the state level. Governors and other policy leaders are now looking to literacy providers to achieve broader state social and economic goals. Initiated by states, the welfare reform movement focused policy attention on the basic skills and other educational needs of welfare recipients. In addition, state concerns about economic competitiveness have spurred many Governors and policy leaders to examine existing efforts to prepare and upgrade the skills of their present and future workforce. In today's internationally competitive and rapidly changing global economy, states can no longer afford the loss in human potential that results from high attrition rates and haphazard approaches to adult learning.

States are beginning to undertake initiatives aimed at improving the effectiveness and delivery of literacy services to adults. Some Governors have established offices for literacy or interagency coordinating bodies. In other states, coordination efforts have been organized through state agencies or the business and industry, labor, or voluntary sectors.

State leadership is required to develop a policy and management infrastructure that supports an expanded and more-responsive adult learning system in order to meet current and future challenges. Strategies for developing this infrastructure were outlined in a 1990 report published by the National Governors' Association, *Educating America: State Strategies for Achieving the National Education Goals*. The report, prepared by NGA's Task Force on Education, presents seven strategies for states to consider in building an infrastructure for literacy:

STRATEGY 1: **Determine the dimensions of the problem.**

STRATEGY 2: **Set priorities and performance expectations.**

STRATEGY 3: **Create accountability systems.**

STRATEGY 4: **Establish comprehensive credentialing systems.**

STRATEGY 5: **Promote professional development.**

STRATEGY 6: **Expand opportunities for experiential learning, and increase the range of settings in which learning occurs.**

STRATEGY 7: **Promote self-directed learning and consumer choice.**

A small number of states have begun the process of building a state policy and management infrastructure for literacy. To date, some states have made important and encouraging progress in determining the dimensions of the problem, setting priorities and performance expectations, creating accountability systems, and expanding opportunities for experiential learning and increasing the range of settings in which learning occurs. However, many states have not yet addressed any of these strategies in a systematic and integrated manner. Furthermore, most have not established comprehensive credentialing systems or professional development programs across delivery systems, or promoted self-directed learning or consumer choice for users of the system.

While the issue of adult literacy has enjoyed increased interest and attention at the national level and expanded activity at the state level, much work remains to be done. To meet the national adult literacy and lifelong learning goal, states must begin to lay the groundwork for building a state-level policy and management infrastructure for literacy that will establish a strong foundation for an integrated adult learning system.

3. State Leadership for Adult Literacy

State leadership is necessary, but not sufficient, for the establishment of an integrated adult learning system. With it, the foundation for a state infrastructure for literacy can begin to be constructed; without it, the opportunity for instituting a "well-coordinated and efficiently operated adult learning system" is greatly diminished.

A State-Level Coordinating Mechanism for Literacy

For many states the first phase in initiating state-level leadership in the area of adult literacy typically is the formation of a state-level coordinating body such as a state coalition or network. Forty states reported having a state-level entity that serves, at a minimum, as a coordinating mechanism for literacy providers in the state (see Table 1).

State coordinating bodies vary significantly in membership, functions and activities, and financial support. (State-level volunteer organizations that coordinate the various volunteer programs in a state are not included in this category. Although it is possible for these entities to evolve into a broader coordinating mechanism, most of them focus exclusively on the needs of volunteer providers and their clients.)

The membership of state-level coordinating bodies usually includes representatives from state agencies that are directly responsible for funding or providing adult literacy and basic skills programs: the state department of education (adult education, vocational education, correctional education), the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training program (JOBS) administrative agencies, and the state library. Other members frequently include representatives from the Governor's office, the state legislature, state-level volunteer organizations, employer associations, and labor organizations. Less often, representatives of the media, local community-based providers, and consumers (adult learners) of the system serve as members.

A primary activity of nearly all of these entities is to raise public awareness of the literacy problem in the state. This is accomplished through media campaigns, state conferences or meetings, and information sharing via newsletters or state literacy hotlines. In addition, some actually fund literacy efforts in the state, help develop state policy, provide training and technical assistance, or establish new initiatives to improve the provision of literacy services.

For those bodies that have supplemental financial support, the resources are as varied as the agencies and organizations involved in the provision of adult literacy

Table 1
State-Level Coordinating Bodies for Adult Literacy

State	*Name*	*Lead/Administering Agency*
Alabama	Alabama Literacy Coalition	Alabama Public Library Service
Arizona	State Committee on Adult Education	Legislature/Superintendent of Public Instruction
Arkansas	Governor's Commission on Adult Literacy	Governor's Office
California	California Alliance for Literacy	State Library/Department of Education
Colorado	Colorado Adult Literacy Commission	Department of Education
Connecticut	Connecticut Coalition for Literacy	Department of Education
District of Columbia	Adult Literacy Network	District of Columbia Public Library
Florida	Adult Literacy Policy Academy Team	Governor's Office
Georgia	Interagency Council on Adult Literacy	Office of Adult and Technical Education
Hawaii	Governor's Council for Literacy	Governor's Office
Idaho	Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy	Consortium
Indiana	Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition	Governor's Office/ Superintendent of Public Instruction
Iowa	Iowa Literacy Council	Department of Education
Kansas	Kansas Alliance for Literacy	N/A
Kentucky	Kentucky Literacy Commission	Workforce Development Cabinet
Maine	Maine Literacy Coalition	Department of Education and Cultural Services
Maryland	Literacy Works Management Team	Governor's Employment and Training Council
Massachusetts	Interagency Literacy Group	Governor's Office
Michigan	Michigan Adult Literacy Initiative	Department of Education
Minnesota	Interagency Adult Learning Advisory Council	State Planning Agency
Mississippi	Advisory Council on Adult Education	Governor's Office
Missouri	Literacy Investment for Tomorrow-Missouri	N/A
Nevada	Governor's Literacy Coalition Advisory Council	Nevada Literacy Coalition
New Mexico	New Mexico Coalition for Literacy	N/A
New York	New York State Literacy Council	N/A
North Carolina	Governor's Advisory Council on Literacy	Department of Administration
North Dakota	North Dakota Coalition for Adult Literacy	N/A
Ohio	Ohio Literacy Network	N/A
Oklahoma	Oklahoma Literacy Initiatives Commission	N/A
Oregon	Advisory Committee for Adult Education and Literacy	Office of Community Colleges
Pennsylvania	State Coalition for Adult Literacy	Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy
Rhode Island	Rhode Island Adult Literacy Council	Department of Education
South Dakota	South Dakota Literacy Council	N/A
Tennessee	Tennessee Literacy Coalition	N/A
Texas	Texas Literacy Council	Department of Commerce
Utah	Utah Literacy Coalition	Department of Education
Virginia	Virginia Literacy Initiative	*
Washington	Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy	N/A
West Virginia	West Virginia Adult Literacy Coalition	N/A
Wyoming	Wyoming Alliance for Literacy	State Library

NOTES: N/A means either the information was not available or the survey question was not applicable.

*The Virginia Literacy Initiative is a combined effort of the Virginia Literacy Foundation and the state's adult literacy office.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Literacy Initiatives, 1990.

and basic skills. According to the survey, the three most common sources of financial support are the state education department's adult education division, the JTPA system, and the state library system. Other funding sources include state legislatures (general revenue funds), membership dues, state departments of commerce or welfare, or private foundations. Because financial support implies "ownership," the ideal situation is to have the coordinating body funded from a variety of sources and/or supported by an independent staff.

Leadership for a State Literacy Infrastructure

Establishing a state-level mechanism to coordinate state literacy activities is an important preliminary phase in both initiating state leadership and building a state infrastructure for an adult learning system. The coalition/network phase offers an opportunity to bring together the relevant players in a state, and provides a forum to discuss issues regarding the development of the system. However, establishing a state-level coalition/network does not guarantee that a system will naturally evolve from it, nor, more important, does it mean that an adult learning system has been instituted.

In building an integrated adult learning system, strong and committed leadership serves as a catalyst to:

- Integrate planning and formalize coordination and collaboration among all state-level and statewide providers and funders of adult literacy and basic skills services;
- Facilitate the involvement of the Governor, the Governor's staff, state legislators, and other state officials in formulating and implementing literacy policies and programs; and
- Monitor and evaluate programs to ensure that the literacy needs of adult learners are effectively met.

This progression at the state level from the coalition/network phase through development of a literacy infrastructure to eventual implementation of an integrated system requires strong and committed state-level leadership. The leadership required for initiating integrated policy development and fostering broad-based support for the implementation of a state adult learning system can take many forms. Four state leadership strategies can significantly improve a state's chances to successfully develop and sustain essential components of a state system:

- Strong gubernatorial leadership and direct involvement in policy formulation and planning.
- Strong state-level leadership from outside the Governor's office with indirect but strong support from the Governor's office.
- Strong leadership from the state legislature, including participation in policy formulation and planning and commitment of state resources.

- Strong leadership from the private sector, in partnership with the public sector, with substantial involvement in policy and program development and resource development.

These four sources of leadership are not mutually exclusive. Each state has its own set of unique internal circumstances, including gubernatorial priorities; political environment; fiscal capacity; historical relationships among and between state agencies and other statewide organizations administering or funding literacy programs; and personal relationships among key state leaders. Leadership strategies can be used in different combinations to achieve success.

State leadership can come from a variety of sources, and each strategy benefits state literacy efforts differently. The leadership and direct involvement of the Governor often are more valuable than other sources of state leadership. However, to ensure ongoing and long-term support for literacy initiatives originating in the Governor's office, assistance from other sources of state leadership can be important. For states that rely heavily on the Governor's support and involvement, it can also be advantageous to gain the commitment of other state agencies, the state legislature, state volunteer organizations, and the private sector.

Gubernatorial Leadership. The survey findings suggest that the Governor's leadership and/or direct involvement can take many forms. These include establishment of an office for literacy under the auspices of the Governor's office, creation of a Governor's commission, task force, or other body with a focus on adult literacy and basic skills, development of a gubernatorial initiative to directly impact the coordination or funding of literacy services in the state, and the use of federal discretionary funds for gubernatorial initiatives directly related to adult literacy (see Table 2).

According to the survey, some type of Governor's literacy office exists in six states (Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, and South Carolina). All of these offices are serving a coordination function to some degree, though the scope of their activity and their resources vary considerably.

In Louisiana, the Office of Literacy was established in 1990 to facilitate coordination of literacy efforts in the state, advise the Governor on literacy-related policy, and serve as an advocate for literacy providers. Established by executive action in 1988, Mississippi's Office for Literacy serves as the Governor's coordinating office for all public and nonpublic activities related to adult functional literacy. The office identifies public resources, provides technical assistance, and supplies information and policy direction to literacy efforts throughout the state.

In Hawaii, the Governor's Office of Children and Youth serves as the focal point for literacy efforts for the Governor. The Commonwealth Literacy Campaign in Massachusetts has operated since 1987 through the Governor's Office of Human Resources. It is supported by a state appropriation and funds from state agencies. The campaign coordinates literacy policy and planning through a ten-member Interagency Literacy Group that sponsors interagency efforts such as the Workplace Education Initiative, and develops programs such as the Commonwealth Literacy Corps.

Table 2
Leadership for Adult Literacy From the Governor's Office

State	*Literacy Office*[1]	*Coordinating Mechanism*[2]	*Governor's Initiative*[3]	*Discretionary Funds*[4]
Arkansas		■	■	
Florida		■	■	
Hawaii	■	■		
Indiana	■	■		
Louisiana	■			
Maryland		■		
Massachusetts	■	■		■
Minnesota			■	
Mississippi	■	■		■
Missouri			■	■
Nevada		■		
New Mexico				■
New York		■	■	
North Carolina		■		
Pennsylvania			■	
South Carolina	■			■
Utah			■	
West Virginia			■	

NOTES: [1]Literacy Office: Existence of an office for literacy under the direct administration of the Governor's office.

[2]Coordinating Mechanism: Existence of a coordinating body for literacy administered by or under the authority of the Governor's office.

[3]Governor's Initiative: An initiative specifically related to literacy that originated from the Governor's office.

[4]Discretionary Funds: Governor has specifically targeted federal discretionary funds to a literacy activity.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Literacy Initiatives, 1990.

Indiana and South Carolina have established offices under the auspices of the Governor's office to focus specifically on workforce literacy. Indiana's Office of Workforce Literacy was established in 1990 by legislative action. The Governor's Initiative for Work Force Excellence in South Carolina was established in 1988 by executive order.

Ten states reported having a coordinating body for adult literacy that was created by, or is administered through, the Governor's office (Arkansas, Florida, Hawaii, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nevada, New York, and North Carolina). In Arkansas, the Governor's Advisory Commission on Adult Literacy was appointed by the Governor in 1987. The commission issued the Arkansas Plan for Literacy Enhancement in 1988. In 1989 the General Assembly created a permanent commission, which was reconstituted in May of that year. The Governor's Commission on Adult Literacy is a "board of directors" for literacy in Arkansas that utilizes a "business-like" approach. The commission reports directly to the Governor

and serves as a "catalyst, coordinating, and assistance organization to the literacy providers."

The Hawaii Governor's Council for Literacy is a state-level literacy coalition that is administered by the Governor's Office of Children and Youth. Established in 1987 by legislative action, the council receives strong financial support from the state legislature and the private sector. Among its stated responsibilities are increasing public awareness of the literacy problem and available programs in the state, developing public/private partnerships, providing training and assistance to literacy providers, and coordinating literacy efforts statewide.

In Maryland, oversight for the state's interagency literacy initiative has been provided by the Education Committee of the Governor's Employment and Training Council. Two years ago the Governor established the Interagency Committee for Adult Literacy to advance a comprehensive workforce investment legislative initiative. The committee, composed of representatives from state and local agencies and interest groups, is now known as the Literacy Works Management Team and coordinates implementation of the initiative.

Eight states reported current literacy initiatives originating from the Governor's office (Arkansas, Florida, Minnesota, Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania, Utah, and West Virginia). Florida's Adult Literacy Act of 1987, which directs local education agencies to target existing resources to assist illiterate adults, was an outgrowth of the state's participation in a national policy academy on adult literacy initiated through the Governor's office. In Minnesota, the Interagency Adult Learning Advisory Council is located in the State Planning Agency. Members of the council serve as policy staff to the Governor. The council provides grants to local communities to implement interagency adult learning team-building activities and supports a statewide workplace literacy technical assistance effort.

An early recommendation from the Governor's Advisory Council on Literacy led to the establishment of Literacy Investment for Tomorrow - Missouri. LIFT-Missouri is a private nonprofit statewide organization that serves as a state clearinghouse for literacy information, funds local literacy efforts, and sponsors training programs. The goal of LIFT-Missouri is to enhance literacy services throughout the state.

Seventeen states responded that their Governors are using federal discretionary funds from the JTPA and/or Wagner-Peyser Acts to promote or provide adult literacy services. In most cases, these funds flow through the Governor's office to other state agencies to provide or supplement adult literacy services as a component of other state programs. In Ohio, 20 percent of the JTPA 8 percent discretionary funds flow to local service delivery areas to provide literacy and basic skills services for JTPA participants. In Washington, as well as in other states, JTPA 8 percent funds are being used to provide English-as-a-Second-Language and basic skills services in JTPA pre-employment and job training programs.

Five states report that their Governor has specifically earmarked federal discretionary funds to an adult literacy activity that he or she has personally identified (Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, and South Carolina). In all five

states, the Governor has designated a portion of JTPA 8 percent funds to support an entity within the Governor's office that coordinates statewide literacy efforts.

In Mississippi, the Governor specifically directed that adult literacy programs were to receive priority in the allocation of JTPA 8 percent funds. This resulted in the implementation of Mississippi's JTPA 8 Percent Literacy Initiative. The Governor's Office for Literacy was a partner with the state education department and the labor assistance division in a cooperative effort to administer and monitor the program. Three basic skills delivery regions were established in the state to manage the program. In program year 1989, the initiative awarded contracts totaling more than $1.6 million to forty-five literacy programs to provide literacy and basic skills services to JTPA-eligible clients.

JTPA 8 percent funds are used by the Governor in Massachusetts to support the Commonwealth Literacy Campaign and Massachusetts Workplace Education Initiative. Missouri's Governor uses a small portion of JTPA 8 percent funds to support the efforts of LIFT-Missouri. In New Mexico, the Governor has earmarked JTPA 8 percent funds to support the work of the New Mexico Coalition for Literacy. South Carolina's Governor has targeted JTPA 8 percent funds to the Governor's Initiative for Work Force Excellence.

Legislative Leadership. In a number of states, legislatures have played a leadership role in adult literacy. Based on the survey, thirty states have enacted literacy-specific legislation during the last four years (see Table 3). In most states, the role of the legislature has complemented the leadership of the Governor or another entity such as a state agency or state literacy coalition. However, some state legislators command the position and resources to assume a primary leadership role in adult literacy efforts.

Literacy-specific legislation generally falls into one of two categories: appropriation legislation to provide grants for certain types of literacy programs (e.g., family or workplace literacy) or authorizing legislation to create a state office or agency for adult literacy. Additionally, state legislatures can establish mandates or change regulations in an effort to broaden access to literacy services. New Hampshire's legislature voted to permit all school districts in the state to provide educational services to adults. In Oregon, the legislature mandated that all state prisons were to have literacy programs in place by 1988. To date, Mississippi is the only state to enact a tax credit as a financial incentive for private firms to establish basic skills programs for their employees.

In California, the state legislature has assumed a uniquely active leadership role in the area of workplace literacy. The California State Legislature's Joint Committee on the State's Economy and its Senate Select Committee on Small Business Enterprises held public hearings in March 1989 on the workforce literacy problem in the state. As a result of these hearings, the California Workforce Literacy Task Force was created by the legislature later that year. The mission of the task force was to review workforce literacy issues and develop specific recommendations for the legislature's consideration that will help establish a long-range plan to enhance workforce literacy. In November 1990, the task force issued its recommendations in

a report, *California's Workforce for the Year 2000: Improving Productivity by Expanding Opportunities for Education and Training of Underserved Youth and Adults.*

Other Sources of State Leadership. States without the direct involvement and strong commitment of the Governor or legislature often will have to rely on the leadership of those in state-level agencies or organizations, such as the state departments of education, economic development, or labor, or state literacy commission or

Table 3
Literacy-Specific State Legislation Enacted During the Last Four Years

State	*Description of Legislation*
Arkansas	Establishes Governor's Commission on Adult Literacy.
California	Families for Literacy Act; Establishes California Library Literacy Service.
Florida	Adult Literacy Act; Model Adult Literacy Centers; Florida Adult Literacy Plan; Education for Handicapped Adults; Education for State Prisoners.
Georgia	Establishes new Department of Technical and Adult Education.
Hawaii	Family Literacy Pilot Programs; Literacy Outreach Specialist.
Illinois	Secretary of State's Office Literacy Grants.
Indiana	Establishes Governor's Office of Workforce Literacy; Literacy requirement for state prisoners.
Kentucky	Establishes new Cabinet on Workforce Development.
Louisiana	Establishes Governor's Office of Literacy; Literacy-based parole.
Maine	Support for Maine Literacy Coalition.
Maryland	Literacy Works Initiative Grants.
Massachusetts	Support for library literacy programs.
Michigan	Support for corrections literacy programs and social services literacy programs.
Minnesota	Support for Interagency Adult Learning Advisory Council.
Mississippi	Basic Skills Income Tax Credit; B.E.S.T. Legislation.
Nebraska	Support for coordination of volunteer programs.
Nevada	Establishes literacy office in state library.
New Hampshire	Permits school districts to provide adult education services.
New Mexico	Funds New Mexico Coalition for Literacy Grants; Inmate Literacy Act.
New York	Establishes literacy program for incarcerated youth; support for basic skills services to welfare recipients; support for union-sponsored workplace literacy programs; support for adult literacy programs in agencies not eligible for school formula aid.
North Carolina	Establishes community colleges as primary providers of literacy services.
Oklahoma	Establishes Oklahoma Literacy Initiatives Commission; support for literacy services at adult learning centers.
Oregon	Mandates literacy programs in all state prisons.
Pennsylvania	Permits high school graduates to be served with adult literacy funds.
South Carolina	Support for South Carolina Literacy Association.
Texas	Establishes Texas Literacy Council.
Virginia	Support for state literacy office.
Washington	Funds Community College Tutor Coordination Grants.
West Virginia	Authorizes income tax form check-off to support adult literacy.
Wisconsin	Support for correction education programs.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Literacy Initiatives, 1990.

task force. However, when the primary leadership comes from outside the Governor's office, it is nonetheless important to maintain gubernatorial interest and support for literacy efforts in the state. In such cases, a state may actually gain the dual advantages of having support from the Governor's office with direct leadership from a more "permanent" source. The state division of adult education or some type of state-level commission or task force generally performs this role.

4. State Strategies for Literacy

Determining the Dimensions of the Literacy Problem

A critical first step is to understand the size and nature of the literacy problem. Yet, reliable and accurate data on the scope of this problem are sorely lacking. At the national level, two important studies are underway to help fill this information gap. The U.S. Department of Labor and the Educational Testing Service (ETS) are nearing completion of a Workplace Literacy Assessment that will assess the literacy skills of JTPA and employment service and unemployment insurance populations. ETS also is conducting the National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS) for the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics to assess the literacy skills of a nationally representative sample of adults more than sixteen years of age.

State-specific literacy assessments are rare. Many states have collected state-level estimates on the size of their literacy problem, which are based on available Census data. However, information based on Census data usually is not considered accurate or reliable for the following reasons: the data are self-reported, grade levels are used to determine literacy skills, and important populations are excluded from the survey. Furthermore, while Census data reflect changes in grade-level completion, such data cannot be used to measure the impact of other literacy programs on the basic skills abilities of the population. Completion of nine years of formal education typically is an indicator of individuals' literacy and basic skills abilities. However, using this measure alone to determine whether literacy improvements have occurred can yield misleading results, as some may have enhanced their literacy skills through adult programs. In addition, during a ten-year period, the number of individuals with less than a ninth-grade education can be expected to decrease due to mortality. Noted changes in literacy levels might simply reflect the fact that individuals with lower grade-level completions have passed away.

While many states recognize the inherent problems of using Census data, they also understand the reality of shrinking resources. Given the high cost of conducting state-specific literacy assessments and limited program dollars, states often must choose between collecting data or using funds for direct services. The following passage from Washington's State Plan for Adult Basic Education summarizes the current predicament many states have in assessing the dimensions of their literacy problem.

> The state of Washington has not conducted a formal study of the degree of illiteracy in the state. Although proposals to conduct such a study have been made ... the estimated cost and the fact that the funds to conduct the study would come from the limited funds available to provide literacy services have deterred the further development of the proposals. Instead, the state has relied on ... other indicators of the illiteracy rate.

Wisconsin's Literacy 2000 Task Force reported in September 1988 that 492,720 state residents operated at or below a level of functional illiteracy, while another 412,720 were deemed "at risk." A categorization scheme developed by Harvard University Professor Jeanne Chall applying 1980 Census data was used to derive these figures. Grade-level completion reported on Census forms of Wisconsin residents was taken as the measure of adult literacy. Persons who reported completing four or fewer grades were classified as "totally illiterate," while those completing grades five through eight were classified as "functionally illiterate." Those who had completed some high school education, but did not graduate, were labeled "at risk." Based on 1980 Census data, "This brings the total population in need of adult literacy education to 905,440 including totally illiterate, functionally illiterate, and 'at-risk' literate."

The Minnesota Adult Literacy Policy Group's final report identified their target group based on estimates from 1980 Census data as the "approximately 300,000 adults in our state between the ages of eighteen and sixty-five...[without] a high school diploma." Utah's Adult Education Program Plan for fiscal years 1990-1993 cited the population in need as the 199,563 residents more than sixteen years of age who, based on 1980 Census data, did not have a high school diploma and were not enrolled in school. Based on 1980 Census data, Washington's State Plan for Adult Basic Education identified 329,482 functionally illiterate adults in the state as those who had not completed the ninth grade.

Four states have attempted to move beyond this reliance on Census data by conducting their own state-specific assessments based on more reliable and accurate approaches (see Table 4). The commonwealth of Puerto Rico undertook a scientific survey in 1986 of the fifty municipalities with the highest reported percentages of

Table 4
State-Specific Assessments on the Nature of the Literacy Problem*

State	*Type of Assessment*
Hawaii	Contracted with private firm to conduct statewide literacy assessment of general population.
Mississippi	Utilized Educational Testing Service instrument developed for National Workplace Literacy Assessment.
Oregon	Utilized Educational Testing Service instrument developed for National Workplace Literacy Assessment.
Puerto Rico	Assessed sample of population in fifty municipalities with highest rates of illiteracy.

NOTE: *Excludes assessments based on information extrapolated from Census data.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Literacy Initiatives, 1990.

illiteracy to obtain a more accurate picture of the literacy problem in those areas. In 1989 the Hawaii Governor's Office of Children and Youth contracted with Omnitrak Research and Marketing Group, Inc., to conduct the Hawaii Statewide Literacy Needs Assessment. This assessment found that 19 percent of Hawaii's adult population, an estimated 154,000 individuals, are functionally illiterate; according to this assessment, 60,000 of these functionally illiterate adults are employed.

More significantly, Mississippi and Oregon have used the assessment instrument developed by ETS for the U.S. Department of Labor's Workplace Literacy Assessment to conduct statewide literacy assessments. The survey instrument assesses individuals' actual applied basic skills in the areas of prose, document, and quantitative literacy tasks. When completed, Mississippi and Oregon will be the first two states to have comprehensive statewide information on the dimension of their adult literacy problem. Results are expected in 1991.

One promising development for states interested in conducting statewide literacy assessments is the option to purchase state-specific surveys in conjunction with the National Adult Literacy Survey being conducted by ETS and the U.S. Department of Education. The two plans, available to states at different costs, will enable them to gain reliable and accurate information on their literacy problem. At this writing, ten to fifteen states have expressed varying degrees of interest in pursuing this option, though presently no state has actually signed a contract. States are being encouraged to pool funds from a variety of sources, including the division of adult education, JTPA, JOBS, the Governor's office, and economic development agencies, to pay for this assessment.

Only a small number of states currently are implementing an assessment mechanism that will enable them to measure the fluctuation in their literacy rate over time. Even if some states decide to participate in a state-specific survey in conjunction with NALS, the vast majority of states will be operating well into the 1990s with information about their literacy problem extrapolated from Census data. And information from the Census does not permit a state to measure its progress in eliminating illiteracy.

Setting Priorities and Establishing Performance Expectations for Literacy Services

In an ideal world, all providers of literacy services in a state would mutually agree upon priorities and performance expectations to which they each would be held accountable. As a starting point, states should follow the lead of the Governors and the President and establish state goals for literacy. Beyond that, priorities should be established to ensure that gaps in services to hard-to-serve populations and other important consumers of the system are eliminated and that performance objectives are based on learner outcomes, rather than the number of clients served. Incentives also should be established to encourage nonpublic providers to participate in this effort.

The survey responses indicate that performance objectives and targeting priorities at the state level, where they exist, most often reflect generic goals for

improving services and broad-brush policy objectives. Performance measures rarely apply across programs nor do they deal with learner outcomes.

Given the myriad of adult literacy and basic skills programs and the limited funds to serve all those in need of services, setting statewide priorities and establishing measurable performance expectations for all publicly funded services are vital to operating an efficient and effective adult learning system. The survey findings indicate that close to one-third of the states have developed state goals related to adult literacy (see Table 5).

Table 5
States with State-Level Goals for Literacy

Statewide Outcome Goals	*Statewide Process Goals*
Delaware	Arkansas
Florida	Delaware
Maryland	Hawaii
Minnesota	Louisiana
Mississippi	Maryland
Washington	Massachusetts
West Virginia	New Mexico
	North Dakota
	Pennsylvania
	Puerto Rico
	Utah
	Wisconsin

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Literacy Initiatives, 1990.

Some states have set broad statewide outcome goals for literacy similar to the national goal adopted by the Governors and endorsed by the President. In Minnesota, the Governor has established a state outcome goal to increase the high school graduation rate to 96 percent by 1996; while not directly stated in terms of adult literacy, the achievement of this goal obviously will have a direct impact on the literacy problem in the state. Mississippi has called for 90 percent of its population to be literate by the year 2000, while West Virginia's goal states that by the year 2000, all working age adults will be functionally literate.

Florida established broad statewide outcome goals when it participated in the Council of State Policy and Planning Agencies' State Policy Academy on Enhancing Adult Literacy. The goals call for a reduction in the percentage of the adult population lacking basic literacy skills (defined as below the fourth-grade level) from the current level of 3.5 percent to 2 percent; and functional literacy skills (defined as below the eighth-grade level) from the current level of 18 percent to 10 percent.

Other states have established statewide process goals that are directly related to program objectives such as expanding the number of literacy programs, increasing literacy enrollments, and developing local literacy coalitions. Arkansas has called for the number of individuals pursuing literacy enhancement to increase from the present number of 29,000 per year to 100,000 by 1994.

Hawaii has established statewide process goals for literacy that include developing literacy coalitions on all the islands, designing a state literacy infrastructure, and expanding family literacy and workplace literacy programs in the state. The strategic three-year plan of the New Mexico Coalition for Literacy contains three process goals: advocate the importance of literacy and the value of reading in all languages; encourage expansion of literacy programs statewide so that literacy instruction is available to adults in every New Mexico community; and foster the development of local literacy programs and coordinate and improve local literacy efforts.

Utah and Wisconsin noted on their survey forms that state process goals exist for adult basic education, though these goals do not pertain to other adult literacy and basic skills programs the state may provide.

Two states—Delaware and Maryland—have established outcome and process goals. In September 1990, Delaware held an Adult Literacy Summit during which participants adopted the outcome goal that "By the year 2000, every adult Delawarean will be literate." Six subgoals also were adopted along with specific strategies for achieving them. The process goals included defining literacy, targeting resources, coordinating public and private efforts, and monitoring and evaluating outcomes.

Maryland's Literacy Works Management Team has established an outcome goal to eliminate illiteracy in the state by the year 2000. The process goals incorporate objectives such as a 25 percent increase in literacy program enrollments, increases in literacy resources and services, and expansion of teacher training opportunities.

In a report issued last year by NGA's State Literacy Exchange, *Meeting the Goal of a Literate America: The State Response*, Jack Brizius argued that targeting decisions for adult literacy and basic skills programs often are based on the larger policy priorities of Governors, state legislators, and other state officials. He identified three current policy priorities of states that have an impact on targeting.

- A policy priority to increase economic competitiveness leads to targeting existing and potential members of the workforce to workplace literacy programs.
- A policy priority to reduce the escalating costs of social programs leads to targeting participants to welfare-to-work and job training programs with literacy services.
- A policy priority to conserve scarce public resources by investing in programs that have the greatest long-term impact leads to targeting parents and their children to intergenerational family literacy programs.

A number of states have focused on the development of workforce and workplace literacy efforts. Other states, such as Kentucky and North Carolina, have made families in need a priority, urging their participation in family literacy programs. Still other states, such as California, Massachusetts, and New York, have targeted welfare recipients by enhancing the literacy and basic skills services of their state welfare-to-work programs.

Targeting also occurs at the state level through self-initiated agreements among provider agencies and through state legislative mandates. Pennsylvania's Adult Literacy Act establishes funding priorities for state dollars for welfare recipients, the unemployed, displaced homemakers, minority groups, and otherwise eligible adults with less than a fifth-grade education.

Establishing State-Level Performance Standards and Quality Measures for Adult Literacy Programs

A comprehensive accountability system should be created to ensure that publicly funded adult literacy programs are of the highest quality and meet the needs of adult learners. Complementary and compatible performance standards should be determined that use consistent definitions and assessment practices and that span the range of related programs. These standards should be clear and measurable and should take into account learner outcomes and their relationship to the demands of the workplace and society. Unfortunately, the program performance standards that typically exist are specific to one program and often are based on enrollment and completion levels rather than improvements in basic skills competencies and long-term impacts for the students.

Most of the fourteen states reporting that they had statewide program performance standards and quality measures identified client-related performance standards (i.e., standards established for participants in specific programs such as adult basic education, JTPA, or JOBS). These standards typically relate to individual client information such as retention in the program, number of completers, or client progress/improvement (see Table 6).

Quality measures refer to program elements that facilitate the achievement of client-related performance standards. Massachusetts' Workforce Literacy Plan

Table 6
States with State-Level Program Performance Standards and Quality Measures

Client-Related Performance Standards	*Program-Related Quality Measures*
Arkansas	Indiana*
Florida	Maryland
Louisiana	Massachusetts
Mississippi	
Missouri	
Nebraska	
New York	
North Dakota	
Puerto Rico	
Utah	
Washington	

NOTE: *Under development.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Literacy Initiatives, 1990.

calls for a state literacy system that includes mechanisms for program evaluation to identify ways to deliver literacy services, mechanisms for accountability to ensure the best use of public resources, and mechanisms for periodic review of programs to ensure that the system is responsive to demographic, economic, and labor market changes. Developed by Massachusetts' Interagency Literacy Group, the elements for effective literacy services identified in this plan will guide the Request for Proposals process, program evaluations, and technical assistance efforts for all ten participating state agencies.

Two other states indicated that they are working toward developing program-related quality measures. Maryland is requiring a standard for all state adult literacy programs to use the Maryland Adult Performance Program (MAPP)/Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) assessment method to obtain consistent information on student performance across programs. The three tasks of Indiana's new Office of Workforce Literacy are to develop certain performance standards as they relate to workforce literacy initiatives; develop a common database, reporting system, and evaluation system relating to basic skills programs; and establish an application process for basic skills training providers that emphasizes performance-based outcomes.

Although Indiana, Maryland, and Massachusetts are three states that appear to be taking steps toward developing a common set of quality measures across publicly funded adult literacy programs, most states have not yet addressed this issue. Clearly, different federally mandated client-related performance standards for programs, such as JTPA and JOBS, make across-the-board client-related performance standards difficult to develop. Mississippi has added its own state-developed client-related performance standards for these programs to complement the federally mandated standards and improve the quality of the measurable outcomes. Yet, one of the major barriers to measuring and improving the quality of adult literacy programs continues to be the inadequate and inconsistent performance standards used across programs to measure their effectiveness.

Expanding Opportunities for Experiential Learning and Promoting Contextual Literacy Programs

Diverse learning opportunities should be available to adults in need of literacy services. While some adults do well in more traditional public education settings, many are better served in alternative environments that emphasize applied learning and contextual instruction. Contextual instruction implies that learning is related to a set of circumstances or facts that surround an event or situation directly relevant to the individual's reasons for learning. As David Harmon asserts in his book, *Literacy: A National Dilemma*, "It is not enough that people are motivated to acquire literacy or develop it to higher levels of ability. Literacy must assume a real role in people's lives if it is to endure." Literacy instruction is most successful for adults when they perceive that their learning is part of a goal they wish to attain.

Workplace and Workforce Education Programs. The survey responses suggest that states are becoming interested in workplace and workforce education, and have begun to develop and implement initiatives to address this issue. States are

promoting the development of these efforts by establishing state-level coordinating mechanisms, implementing programs that provide funding and other supports, and offering financial incentives to employers. It is important for states to examine and identify an appropriate role for working with the private sector to develop workforce skills. It is especially important that they work with small and medium-sized businesses and encourage literacy programs for employees below the managerial level.

Workplace and workforce education programs are recognized as effective methods for providing adults with literacy instruction that is applied and relevant to their own lives. In general, workplace education refers to programs that are provided to currently employed members of the workforce. Such programs usually are administered by a company, union, or both, or through a consortium of companies and/or unions. Workforce education programs have a broader application because they typically consist of programs for potential members of the workforce and often are designed to prepare the student with a broader set of skills in order to prepare him or her for entry or re-entry into the labor market. Nevertheless, while this distinction is important, in practice these terms are sometimes applied interchangeably.

States are still grappling with their appropriate role in promoting literacy programs for workers. Sixteen states reported implementing some type of state-level "systematic mechanism to foster business and/or union involvement" in adult literacy and basic skills activities, though their approaches differ significantly (see Table 7).

Some states are creating a coordinating body at the state level for workplace or workforce education. Georgia's new Department of Technical and Adult Education will place responsibility for all state adult literacy programs in a single state agency. Perhaps the most ambitious approach is in Kentucky. As part of the comprehensive restructuring of the state education system, which is presently underway there, a new state-level cabinet on workforce development has been established. Though still in its infancy, the Kentucky Cabinet on Workforce Development will bring together all adult education service delivery agencies, including adult and vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, and the Kentucky Literacy Commission. Integrating all workforce development programs in one cabinet should improve the state's ability to work with employers and unions on improving Kentucky's workforce.

The Indiana legislature established an Interdepartmental Board of Workforce Literacy in 1990 and asked the Governor to establish an office of workforce literacy. The interdepartmental board will coordinate workforce literacy programs in Indiana and will include representatives appointed from the state departments of education, higher education, vocational and technical education, employment and training, public welfare, corrections, and others. The Governor's Office of Workforce Literacy will oversee the development of workforce literacy programs in the state, target available funding, and serve as an information clearinghouse on workforce literacy issues.

In its November 1990 report, the California Workforce Literacy Task Force recommended that the Governor and the legislature work together to: promote awareness of the need for a greater investment in literacy skills development; pro-

Table 7
State Approaches to Foster Workplace and Workforce Education Programs

State	*Lead/Administering State Agency*	*Initiative(s)*
Arkansas	Governor's Commission on Adult Literacy	Workplace Initiative for Skills Education
California	State Legislature	California Workforce Literacy Task Force
Georgia	Department of Technical and Adult Education	Georgia Workplace Education Program
Hawaii	Governor's Council for Literacy	Business/Labor Literacy Partnership
Idaho	Department of Employment	Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy
Indiana	Governor's Office	Office of Workforce Literacy
Kentucky	Cabinet on Workforce Development	Cabinet on Workforce Development
Massachusetts	Commonwealth Literacy Campaign	Massachusetts Workplace Education Initiative
Michigan	Governor's Office	Employability Skills Project and Human Investment Fund
Minnesota	Department of Education	"Directions" Workplace Literacy Partnership
Mississippi	Governor's Office for Literacy	Basic Skills Tax Credit and Commission on Workforce Excellence
New York	Department of Education	Bureau of Workforce and Economic Development
Rhode Island	Workforce 2000	Workplace Adult Education Project
South Carolina	Governor's Office	Governor's Initiative for Work Force Excellence
Virginia	Virginia Literacy Initiative	State-funded workplace literacy programs
Wisconsin	Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education	Workplace Literacy Initiative

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Literacy Initiatives, 1990.

vide leadership to improve the education of underserved, traditionally noncollege bound youth and adults; and produce a master plan for the workforce education and training of these individuals in an integrated manner.

Mississippi's recently formed Commission on Workforce Excellence and New York's Bureau of Workforce and Economic Development in the state education department are two other examples of state-level mechanisms to coordinate a response to workplace education issues. The New York bureau promotes the development and operation of workforce development programs in educational agencies that support economic development. Its functions include administering appropriate federal and state programs, monitoring the operation of locally operated workforce development programs, and overseeing the operation of the ten regional education centers in the state. These centers work with companies, unions, economic development agencies, and education agencies to design and develop workforce development programs.

Some states also have established program initiatives at the state level to deal specifically with workplace or workforce education issues. Since 1986, the Commonwealth Literacy Campaign in Massachusetts has coordinated the Massachusetts Workplace Education Initiative. This initiative has funded a wide variety of workplace education programs throughout the state. Extensive formative evaluations of program models provide information to guide program development and technical assistance strategies.

In South Carolina, the Governor's Initiative for Work Force Excellence facilitates a partnership between service providers and employers through business roundtables composed of business representatives appointed by the Governor. Staff support to assess training and development needs and design program strategies is provided by workforce specialists located at each technical college in the state.

Mississippi is the first state to offer businesses a tax credit for providing basic skills instruction to their employees. Twenty-five percent of qualified training-related expenses—including the costs for instructors, instructional materials, equipment, and the construction and maintenance of training facilities—can be credited against state income taxes by employers. The Governor's Office for Literacy, and the state departments of education and economic and community development, have worked together to guide the tax credit through the state legislature and implement this innovative incentive program. Arkansas, Florida, and Louisiana are among other states considering a tax credit for workplace education programs.

Other state examples of workplace or workforce education initiatives include:

- The Hawaii Governor's Council for Literacy facilitates business/labor literacy partnerships by linking employers and unions with educational providers and providing funds through the Governor's office.
- The Idaho Partnership for Workplace Literacy coordinates the delivery of basic skills services in the workplace through a partnership among the Consortium of Area Vocational Education Schools, the Idaho Association of Private Industry Councils, and the Idaho Department of Employment.
- The "Directions" workplace literacy partnership in Minnesota provides complete workplace literacy services (i.e., consultation, needs assessment, a training package, and evaluation) to small businesses and links them with appropriate basic skills providers.

Special Populations. At least seven states have undertaken special efforts to strengthen and coordinate the delivery of adult literacy and basic skills services to specific populations, such as JTPA or JOBS clients, the incarcerated, or the unemployed. In some cases, these coordination efforts require explicit state policies to provide such services to clients in existing second-chance systems. In other cases, new state initiatives have been implemented to target specific populations.

Arkansas' Action Plan for Literacy Enhancement, issued in 1988 by the Governor's Commission on Adult Literacy, identifies six target groups for adult literacy and basic skills services in the state: those receiving public assistance, those receiving unemployment benefits, workers at risk of becoming displaced, state prison inmates, those in the criminal justice systems who may be eligible for alternative

sentencing, and the general population. The commission proposed incremental increases in the delivery of adult literacy services to each of these populations through 1993.

In 1989 Florida established a state policy to target services to its incarcerated population. The Florida Adult Literacy Plan Status Report of 1989 outlined incentives for inmates who achieve functional literacy levels while incarcerated and also required all inmates who are functioning below the ninth-grade level to be enrolled in a literacy program.

Minnesota's legislature established the Local Interagency Adult Learning Program Development Grants program in 1989. Funding for fiscal 1990 was $155,000 and for fiscal 1991 $225,000. The program provides grants ranging from $3,000 to $10,000 to local community teams to enhance adult literacy programs. These teams include representatives from job training/JTPA, JOBS, adult basic education, and postsecondary education agencies. In addition, three of the grants went to Native American agencies. All teams are required to have JTPA, JOBS, minority, and community-based organization representation.

Both prior to and following passage of the Family Support Act of 1988, states have worked toward enhancing literacy and basic skills services for welfare recipients. In 1987 Pennsylvania initiated the Joint Jobs Initiative Single Point of Contact (SPOC) program, which now is the state's vehicle for the implementation of the Family Support Act. Combining federal and state funds, SPOC has provided literacy and basic skills services to more than 3,000 Pennsylvanians. In Hawaii, the Governor's Office of Children and Youth is implementing a family literacy project that includes linking family literacy programs with newly established family resource centers. These centers provide an array of services to families in need, particularly families receiving public assistance. The Commonwealth Literacy Campaign in Massachusetts is developing a program with the department of public welfare to train volunteers as literacy tutors/mentors for welfare recipients enrolled in the state's welfare-to-work initiative (ET Choices).

Since 1989 the New York education department and the department of social services have established eight Adult Centers for Comprehensive Education and Support Services (ACCESS) and thirty Counseling , Assessment, and Support Services for Education and Training (CASSET) sites across the state. ACCESS centers provide a wide range of services at one central location, including adult basic education, nondegree adult occupational training, life skills instruction, and customized short-term training. CASSET sites network with other educational agencies and service providers to ensure that a full range of services is available to adult students in a particular area. During 1989-90, more than half of the individuals receiving services at ACCESS and CASSET sites were on public assistance, and these initiatives are important components of New York's new welfare-to-work education program, Education for Gainful Employment (EDGE).

5. Recommendations for State Action

It is clear from the survey responses that aspects of the nation's adult literacy problem are being successfully addressed by some public agencies or private organizations delivering literacy services. Some states have pursued broad-brush approaches to the problem, while others have focused on one or two dimensions. Generally, however, no state has created a coherent system of widely accessible, high-quality services that is diverse enough and flexible enough to respond to the needs of all individuals. Moreover, states have not yet articulated a clear set of policy objectives for their varied investments in adult education and training nor have they implemented accountability systems that drive performance toward achievement of these objectives.

The following recommendations suggest steps that states can take to promote more strategic public and private action in addressing their literacy problems. Taking these steps will help states maximize the return on public investments in adult learning programs and integrate the literacy services of myriad providers in order to achieve the national goal of a literate citizenry by the year 2000.

Recommendation:

States should demonstrate strong leadership and bring together key literacy leaders to secure the necessary commitment to building a state infrastructure for adult literacy and basic skills.

This leadership role should include:

- Integrating planning and formalizing coordination and collaboration among all delivery systems in the state;
- Facilitating the involvement of all key state-level and statewide players in the formulation and implementation of policy and programs; and
- Monitoring and evaluating all publicly financed programs in the state.

Recommendation:

States should determine the dimensions of their literacy problem by conducting an accurate and reliable assessment of the literacy and basic skills abilities of the adult population.

States should conduct state-specific literacy assessments to reliably and accurately measure the literacy and basic skills abilities of their citizens, and to create a database for measuring progress toward the goal of a literate citizenry.

States should determine what services are available, who is participating in them, where people are getting services, and who is paying for them. This information should be used to set priorities, identify gaps in services, and target services.

Recommendation:

States should set priorities and performance expectations for all publicly financed literacy services, and encourage the private and nonprofit sectors to commit to these priorities and performance expectations.

States should establish statewide performance objectives that are based on learner outcomes and offer incentives to encourage programs of high quality and sufficient duration.

States should identify their priorities across programs to help target services to key populations, industries, economic sectors, or geographic areas.

Recommendation:

States should create accountability systems for all providers that establish clear performance standards and ensure quality programs.

States should develop reliable and consistent information on program performance to enable state leaders and the general public to judge the quality of programs.

States should financially reward providers with high performance results and require corrective action from providers failing to meet the performance standards.

Recommendation:

States should establish comprehensive credentialing systems based on a competency-based approach to skill certification, which begins in school and continues through lifelong learning systems.

States should encourage common terminology and compatible competency-based standards in the credit and credentialing processes of public and private educational institutions.

Recommendation:

States should promote professional development to upgrade the quality of instructors in the adult learning system.

States should establish professional development programs for staff and volunteers in all state-financed programs.

States also should consider implementing quality standards for teachers and administrators in the system.

Recommendation:

States should expand opportunities for experiential learning, and increase the range of settings in which learning occurs.

States should promote the development of programs that provide learning within a real-life context, such as workplace literacy and family literacy programs.

States should provide financial and other incentives to the private sector to encourage investment in upgrading the skills of the current and future workforce.

States should ensure a substantial investment in basic skills services in other public programs such as JTPA and JOBS.

Recommendation:

States should promote self-directed learning and consumer choice.

States should communicate the importance and value of lifelong learning.

States should ensure that information about the adult learning system is readily available through public awareness campaigns and other means.

Achieving a literate citizenry by the year 2000 will require strong and committed state leadership and the development and implementation of a state literacy infrastructure. These recommendations for state action lay out a plan for the development of well-coordinated and efficiently operated state adult learning systems that will facilitate progress toward meeting the national literacy goal.

Appendix A
Survey Instruments

During the summer of 1990, the National Governors' Association's State Literacy Exchange conducted a national survey of state literacy initiatives. Surveys were sent to more than 400 state-level and statewide literacy leaders across the country working in Governors' offices, adult education agencies, correction education offices, state libraries, JTPA and JOBS offices, state literacy coalitions, and other appropriate literacy organizations.

Three different survey instruments were developed. The form for Governors' offices was sent to all Governors' education aides. State agency/state-level organization general information forms and program/activity information forms were sent to state-level and statewide literacy contacts other than the Governors' education aides. The three survey instruments follow.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION
SURVEY OF STATE LITERACY INITIATIVES
(FOR GOVERNORS' OFFICES)

PLEASE NOTE: Throughout this survey, the term "adult literacy and basic skills" is used to refer to literacy or basic skills policies, programs, and other efforts targeted to individuals sixteen years of age or more and out of school.

1. Name of state:_____

2. Respondent's name, title, and telephone number: _____

3. Does your state presently have any of the following adult literacy and basic skills activities under the domain of the Governor's office?

   A) Governor's Literacy Office: ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, briefly describe its responsibilities and activities, staff size, and fiscal support._____

   _____

   _____

   When was the office established? Was it created by executive or legislative action?_____

   _____

   _____

   B) Governor's Coalition or Council: ___ Yes ___ No

   (Such as a Governor's advisory council on adult education, Governor's literacy council, etc.)

   If yes, provide the name of that body and briefly describe its membership (list), responsibilities and activities, and fiscal support._____

   _____

   _____

   When was this body established? _____ Was it created by executive or legislative action? _____

   C) Other Gubernatorial Literacy Initiative: ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, please briefly describe, including date of origin._____

   _____

   _____

4. Within the last year, has the Governor *proposed* any new initiatives, such as legislation or those listed in Question 3, to promote adult literacy or basic skills in your state? ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, please describe. _____

   _____

   _____

5. Is your Governor using federal discretionary funds, such as JTPA 8 percent education coordination funds or those included under the Wagner-Peyser Act, the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act, or the Social Services Block Grant, to promote or provide adult literacy or basic skills services in your state? ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, please describe the funding source, the funding amount, and the type of activity being funded. _____

   _____

   _____

6. Is there a state literacy coalition, council, etc., operating in your state outside of the domain of the Governor's office? ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, briefly describe its responsibilities and activities, sponsor, membership (list), fiscal support, and interaction with the Governor's office, if any. _____

   _____

   _____

7. A) Has any state legislation passed your legislature during the last four years that directly impacted the delivery of literacy or basic skills services to adults in the state?

   ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, briefly describe the legislation, including funding provisions, eligibility for services, and to which agency administrative responsibility has been assigned. (Please include copies, if available.) _____

   _____

   _____

   What impact has the legislation had in your state regarding the provision of literacy or basic skills services to adults? _____

   _____

   _____

   B) Do you know of any recently *proposed* state legislation that will directly impact the delivery of literacy or basic skills services to adults in your state? ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, briefly describe the legislation, including funding provisions, eligibility for services, and administrative responsibility. (Please include copies, if available.) _____

   _____

   _____

8. Has your state undertaken any special efforts, including legislation, to strengthen and/or coordinate the delivery of adult literacy or basic skills services to specific target groups, such as JTPA or welfare clients, immigrants, the incarcerated, the learning disabled, etc.? ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, briefly describe. _____

   _____

   _____

Questions 9 - 12 refer to different aspects of developing and implementing a state infrastructure for delivering adult literacy and basic skills services in your state.

9. Is any state-level information available about the nature of the adult literacy problem in your state? ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, briefly describe the information, including the year the information was collected, how the information was collected (survey, administrative records, etc.), by whom the information was collected, and the segment of the population included. Also please include a copy of any document or report based on this information, if available._____

   If no, does your state have plans to collect such information? If so, how will this information be collected and by whom?_____

10. A) Has your state established any state-level goals for improving adult literacy and basic skills? ___ Yes ___ No

    B) If yes, what are the state goals? When and how were they established? _____

    How, if at all, has the establishment of a national literacy goal influenced the state goals?

    C) If no, does your state have any plans to establish state goals for adult literacy and basic skills? When and how will they be established? _____

    How, if at all, has the establishment of a national literacy goal influenced plans for state goals? _____

11. Has your state established any state-level outcome goals or performance standards for adult literacy and basic skills programs (Adult Education, JTPA, JOBS, etc.)? ___ Yes ___ No

    If yes, by whom and how were they established? Briefly describe the system used for monitoring performance against these goals or standards._____

12. A) Does your state have any systematic mechanisms to foster business and/or union involvement in state adult literacy and basic skills activities? ___ Yes ___ No

    If yes, briefly describe these mechanisms, including the primary partners (businesses and unions) in these efforts._____

13. Do you know of one or two particularly interesting or unique adult literacy or basic skills programs (for instance, programs linked to the state JOBS program, workplace programs, intergenerational programs, volunteer efforts, programs for the homeless, programs for the learning disabled, corrections programs, etc.) operated by your agency/organization or others in your state, either at the state or local level? If so, briefly describe (giving a rationale for its selection) and, if possible, provide the name and telephone number of a contact person. ____

_____

_____

Questions 14, 15, and 16 refer to technical assistance efforts under consideration at NGA and the needs of your agency/organization.

Based on a previous technical assistance needs assessment survey of state literacy providers and the recommendations of the State Literacy Exchange Advisory Committee, it seems evident that more in-depth and tailored technical assistance to state literacy efforts is desired.

NGA is considering developing an intensive and long-term technical assistance effort that would be made available to a small number of selected states on a competitive basis. The purpose of this project would be to assist those states in developing "adult learning systems" that would improve coordination among the state's providers of adult literacy and basic skills services (literacy, welfare, JTPA, education, economic development, etc.) and, more important, build capacity at the local level by strengthening collaboration between the state and local levels.

States would be selected based on a number of criteria, including a commitment from the Governor to assemble a "state team" with representatives from the various systems listed above. This team would participate in two or three policy development work sessions over several months.

14. A) If NGA developed such a project, do you believe your state would be interested in participating? ___ Yes ___ No

    B) If yes, would your state be willing and able to pay the expenses for your state team to attend the work sessions? ___ Yes ___ No

    C) Please provide us with any comments or suggestions you may have on such a project. ____

_____

_____

NGA also is considering the possibility of substituting a series of two or three regional workshops in place of one national state literacy conference. The workshops would be designed to address issues in a more focused manner than the national conference, and might also be accessible to more participants.

15. Would you favor NGA sponsoring a series of regional workshops in place of one national conference? ___ Yes ___ No

    If yes, please provide us with any comments or suggestions you may have for the workshops. __

_____

_____

16. Are there specific areas in which technical assistance would be beneficial to your agency/organization? ___ Yes ___ No

If yes, please indicate these areas. _____

_____

_____

Also on a previous survey, state literacy providers indicated that the methods of technical assistance they most preferred were state/local meetings, on-site assistance, and discussion groups. Written materials and national conferences were less preferred.

17. What methods of technical assistance do you find most useful for yourself and others in your agency/organization? If possible, please match the method of technical assistance most preferred with your specific technical assistance needs identified in Question 15. Please be specific about the intensity (one day, a few days, six months, one year, eighteen months) and focus (state-level or state and local) most beneficial to your agency/organization. _____

_____

_____

18. Who is the primary state contact for literacy issues in the Governor's office?

Name: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

Phone number: _____

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION SURVEY OF STATE LITERACY INITIATIVES (STATE AGENCY/STATE-LEVEL ORGANIZATION GENERAL INFORMATION FORM)

PLEASE NOTE: Throughout this survey, the term "adult literacy and basic skills" is used to refer to literacy or basic skills policies, programs, and other efforts that are targeted to individuals sixteen years of age or more and out of school.

1. Name of agency or organization: _____

2. Primary contact person for literacy:

   Name: _____

   Title: _____

   Address: _____

   Phone Number: _____

3. Briefly describe the general role of your agency/organization in terms of providing literacy or basic skills services to adults in your state. _____

   _____

   _____

4. Does your agency/organization participate on any state literacy councils, coalitions, etc.?

   ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, please describe its responsibilities and activities, membership, and fiscal support. _____

   _____

   _____

5. Do you know of one or two particularly interesting or unique adult literacy or basic skills programs (for instance, programs linked to the state JOBS program, workplace programs, intergenerational programs, volunteer efforts, programs for the homeless, programs for the learning disabled, corrections programs, etc.) operated by your agency/organization or others in your state, either at the state or local level? If so, briefly describe and, if possible, provide the name and telephone number of a contact person. _____

   _____

   _____

Questions 6, 7, and 8 refer to technical assistance efforts under consideration at NGA and the needs of your agency/organization.

Based on a previous technical assistance needs assessment survey of state literacy providers and the recommendations of the State Literacy Exchange Advisory Committee, it seems evident that more in-depth and tailored technical assistance to state literacy efforts is desired.

NGA is considering developing an intensive and long-term technical assistance effort that would be made available to a small number of selected states on a competitive basis. The purpose of this project would be to assist those states in developing "adult learning systems" that would improve coordination among the state's providers of adult literacy and basic skills services (literacy, welfare, JTPA,

education, economic development, etc.) and, more important, build capacity at the local level by strengthening collaboration between the state and local levels.

States would be selected based on a number of criteria, including a commitment from the Governor to assemble a "state team" with representatives from the various systems listed above. This team would participate in two or three policy development work sessions over several months.

6. A) If NGA developed such a project, do you believe your state would be interested in participating? ___ Yes ___ No

   B) If yes, would your state be willing and able to pay the expenses for your state team to attend the work sessions? ___ Yes ___ No

   C) Please provide us with any comments or suggestions you may have on such a project. ___

_____

_____

NGA also is considering the possibility of substituting a series of two or three regional workshops in place of one national state literacy conference. The workshops would be designed to address issues in a more focused manner than the national conference, and might also be accessible to more participants.

7. Would you favor NGA sponsoring a series of regional workshops in place of one national conference? ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, please provide us with any comments or suggestions you may have for the workshops. __

_____

_____

8. Are there specific areas in which technical assistance would be beneficial to your agency/organization? ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, please indicate these areas. _____

_____

_____

_____

Also on a previous survey, state literacy providers indicated that the methods of technical assistance they most preferred were state/local meetings, on-site assistance, and discussion groups. Written materials and national conferences were less preferred.

9. What methods of technical assistance do you find most useful for yourself and others in your agency/organization? If possible, please match the method of technical assistance most preferred with your specific technical assistance needs identified in Question 8. Please be specific about the intensity (one day, a few days, six months, one year, eighteen months) and focus (state-level or state and local) most beneficial to your agency/organization. _____

_____

_____

10. A) Has any state legislation passed your legislature during the last four years that directly impacted the delivery of literacy or basic skills services to adults in the state?

___ Yes ___ No

If yes, briefly describe the legislation, including the funding provisions, eligibility for services, and administrative responsibility. (Please include copies, if available.) _____

_____

_____

What impact has the legislation had in your state regarding the provision of literacy or basic skills services to adults? _____

_____

B) Do you know of any recently *proposed* state legislation that will directly impact the delivery of literacy or basic skills services to adults in your state? ___ Yes ___ No

If yes, briefly describe the legislation, including funding provisions, eligibility for services, and administrative responsibility. (Please include copies, if available.) _____

_____

_____

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION SURVEY OF STATE LITERACY INITIATIVES (AGENCY/ORGANIZATION PROGRAM/ACTIVITY INFORMATION FORM)

Since your agency/organization may administer a number of programs or activities that provide adult literacy or basic skills services in your state, we would like you to complete the following PROGRAM/ACTIVITY INFORMATION FORM as it applies to the programs and activities administered by your agency/organization. You may duplicate the form for each of your programs/activities. THANK YOU.

PLEASE NOTE: Throughout this survey, the term "adult literacy and basic skills" is used to refer to literacy or basic skills policies, programs, and other efforts that are targeted to individuals sixteen years of age or more and out of school.

Many questions on this survey ask about or make reference to actual literacy and basic skills services delivered to adults by the program/activity. However, some programs and activities may not be involved in the direct delivery of such services to participants. If questions on this survey are not applicable to the program or activity operated by your agency or organization, answer only those that are appropriate.

1. Name of agency/organization: _____

2. Name of program/activity: _____

3. Contact person for this program/activity:

   Name: _____

   Title: _____

   Address: _____

   Phone Number: _____

4. Briefly describe the program/activity, including its goals, services, and primary participants.___

   _____

   _____

5. In what year was the program/activity established? ____

6. Because of the many diverse funding streams that flow to adult literacy and basic skills programs and activities, we would like you to complete the following two charts, as accurately as possible, for 1) FEDERAL FUNDS that flow to this program/activity, and 2) for OTHER FUNDS, such as state, local, private sector, foundation, etc., that flow to this program/activity.

   For both charts, we would like you to provide information and the approximate amount of funding from each source for fiscal years 1986 and 1988, and the current fiscal year.

   FEDERAL FUNDS CHART

   Examples of federal funding sources for adult literacy and basic skills programs and activities include, but are not limited to: Adult Education Act Programs (Basic Grants to States, McKinney Act Grants for the Homeless, English Literacy Grants, Workplace Literacy Partnership Grants); Even Start Grants; Library Service and Construction Act Grants (Title I and Title VI); Family Support Act - JOBS Program Funds; JTPA Funds (Titles IIA, IIB, III, 8% Coordination Grants); ACTION/VISTA Grants; State Legalization Impact Assistance Grants (SLIAG); Migrant Education Program; and Refugee Resettlement Funds. Please list funds that this program/activity receive from any of these federal sources, or from any other federal sources that are not listed. (NOTE: for JTPA funding, refer to program year.)

Federal Funding Source	Fiscal 1986	Fiscal 1988	Current Fiscal Year

Of the federal funding sources listed above, which, if any, flow to this program/activity through another state agency or state-level organization and remain under the control of that agency/organization? Please list the funding source, the agency/organization through which the funds flow, and the amount of funds that flow to the program/activity for each.

OTHER FUNDS CHART

Other funding sources would include state-funded programs; private-sector funding; state, regional, or national foundation funding; charitable contributions; local funding support; and any other nonfederal funding sources that fund this program/activity.

Funding Source	Fiscal 1986	Fiscal 1988	Current Fiscal Year

7. On the following chart, please provide the number of applicants (those requesting services), the number of participants served, and the number of successful completers that this program/activity had for fiscal years 1986 and 1988 and the current fiscal year. If you do not have the actual numbers, then provide your best estimates, and please indicate these as estimates. (NOTE: If this activity/program does not provide actual literacy or basic skills services to adults, then do not answer this question.)

	Fiscal 1986	Fiscal 1988	Current Fiscal Year
Program Applicants			
Participants Served			
Successful Completers			

8. How is "successful completer" defined for this program/activity? _____

_____

_____

9. NOTE: For Question 9, the State JOBS Program Director should not answer Part A, and the State JTPA Liaison should not answer Part B.

   A) Are you presently serving, or do you plan to serve, clients that are referred to this program/activity from the state Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program?
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If yes, approximately how many JOBS participants are you serving and what funds are being used to provide these services? Can you serve all JOBS referrals to this program? If not, why not? Who else provides literacy or basic skills services to JOBS participants in your state?_____

   _____

   _____

   B) Are you presently serving, or do you plan to serve, JTPA clients in this program/activity?
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If yes, approximately how many JTPA participants are you serving and what funds are being used to provide these services? Can you serve all JTPA referrals to this program? If not, why not? Who else provides literacy or basic skills services to adult JTPA participants in your state? _____

   _____

   _____

10. Please list any other agencies, organizations, businesses, unions, etc. that you coordinate with on this program/activity, and describe the nature of this coordination. _____

    _____

    _____

11. Are any support services (i.e., child care, transportation, counseling, etc.) provided through this program/activity to the clients? ____ Yes ____ No

    If yes, describe what services are offered, how many clients are receiving these services (please indicate if estimates), and how these services are paid for._____

    _____

    _____

12. A) How does this program/activity assess the literacy and basic skills abilities of its participants? Please describe the methods and instruments used to assess participants' basic skills and tell how and when these methods and/or instruments are used throughout the program/activity.

    B) If available, please provide the most recent summary information (such as percentages of participants at different levels) on the literacy abilities of the participants in this program/activity.

13. A) Are the instructors for this program/activity paid, volunteer, or both?

___ PAID ___ VOLUNTEER ___ BOTH

If both, approximately what percentage of the instructors are paid and what percentage are volunteers? _____

_____

What funding source is used to support paid instructors? _____

_____

_____

B) Are the instructors for this program/activity full-time, part-time, or both?

___ FULL-TIME ___ PART-TIME ___ BOTH

If both, approximately what percentage of the instructors are full-time and what percentage are part-time? _____

_____

How are full-time and part-time defined? _____

_____

_____

14. A) Does this program/activity include a staff development component? ___ Yes ___ No

If yes, briefly describe this component, including how it is funded. _____

_____

_____

B) Approximately what percent of the staff received this training in the past year? ___ %

C) Who delivers the staff development training, and how often is it provided? _____

_____

_____

15. Is this program/activity formally evaluated in any manner? ___ Yes ___ No

If yes, what type of evaluation method is used and how often is the program/activity evaluated?

_____

_____

If this evaluation information is available, please enclose a copy of the most recent evaluation.

16. Have any outcome goals been established for this program/activity? ___ Yes ___ No

If yes, what are they? _____

_____

_____

What has been the program's success in meeting these outcome goals? _____

_____

_____

17. What are the three most important things that would enable this program/activity to improve its services to students, serve additional target groups, and/or increase the number of students that are served? Please be specific. _____

_____

_____

18. What specific technical assistance activities could most benefit this program/activity? _____

_____

_____

Appendix B
Survey Respondents

A total of 390 surveys responses were obtained, with forty-nine states, the commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia each returning at least one survey. This report primarily used information collected through the Governors' offices and state agency/state-level organization general information forms. The following table indicates state respondents to these two survey instruments.

Survey Respondents by State

State	Governor's Office	Adult Education Agency	Correction Education Office	JTPA Agency	JOBS Office	State Library	Other
Alabama	■		■ ■		■		Alabama Literacy Coalition
Alaska		■				■	
Arizona	■	■				■	
Arkansas	■			■	■		Arkansas Literacy Councils, Inc. Governor's Commission on Adult Literacy
California		■	■		■	■	California Literacy, Inc.
Colorado		■		■			
Connecticut		■	■				Literacy Volunteers of America-Connecticut, Inc.
Delaware		■		■	■	■	
District of Columbia		■	■			■	Push Literacy Action Now (PLAN)
Florida	■	■	■	■	■		Association of Florida Laubach Organizations Florida Literacy Coalition, Inc.
Georgia		■				■	
Hawaii	■	■	■			■	Governor's Council for Literacy Hawaii Literacy, Inc.
Idaho			■	■	■		
Illinois				■	■		Literacy Volunteers of America-Illinois, Inc. Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center
Indiana	■		■				Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition
Iowa		■	■			■	
Kansas		■			■	■	

Survey Respondents by State (continued)

State	Governor's Office	Adult Education Agency	Correction Education Office	JTPA Agency	JOBS Office	State Library	Other
Kentucky							Kentucky Literacy Commission
Louisiana	■				■		Louisiana Coalition for Literacy, Inc. Louisiana Office of Literacy
Maine			■				Maine Literacy Coalition
Maryland	■		■				Maryland State Literacy Coalition
Massachusetts	■				■	■	Commonwealth Literacy Campaign
Michigan			■		■		Michigan Literacy, Inc. Michigan Adult Literacy Initiative Governor's Office for Job Training
Minnesota	■			■	■		
Mississippi	■	■	■			■	Governor's Office for Literacy
Missouri	■	■	■			■	Literacy Investment for Tomorrow (LIFT)-Missouri
Montana		■			■		
Nebraska	■	■		■			Literacy Councils of Nebraska, Inc.
Nevada		■		■		■	Nevada Literacy Coalition
New Hampshire	■	■		■			
New Jersey		■		■	■	■	New Jersey Network Focus on Literacy, Inc. Newark Literacy Campaign, Inc. Literacy Volunteers of America-New Jersey, Inc.
New Mexico	■		■	■			New Mexico Coalition for Literacy
New York	■	■	■			■	
North Carolina		■			■		Governor's Advisory Council on Literacy
North Dakota	■	■		■		■	

Survey Respondents by State (continued)

State	Governor's Office	Adult Education Agency	Correction Education Office	JTPA Agency	JOBS Office	State Library	Other
Ohio	■	■	■		■		
Oklahoma				■	■		Oklahoma Literacy Initiatives Commission
Oregon		■	■				
Pennsylvania	■	■	■	■	■	■	Tutors of Literacy of the Commonwealth Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy
Puerto Rico	■			■			
Rhode Island		■				■	Literacy Volunteers of America-Rhode Island, Inc.
South Carolina	■	■			■	■	
South Dakota			■	■	■	■	
Tennessee		■					Tennessee Literacy Coalition
Texas		■			■	■	Literacy Volunteers of America-Texas Texas Literacy Council
Utah	■			■		■	
Virgin Islands	■						
Virginia		■	■				Virginia Literacy Foundation Office of State Adult Literacy
Washington	■	■	■	■			
West Virginia	■	■			■	■	Literacy Volunteers of West Virginia West Virginia Adult Literacy Coalition
Wisconsin	■		■	■	■	■	
Wyoming		■				■	

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Literacy Initiatives, 1990.

Appendix C
Selected Aggregate Survey Responses

The following table presents aggregate state responses to selected survey questions. Information from individual states may not be included if appropriate surveys were not returned.

Selected Aggregate Responses, by State, to Governors' Offices and State Agency/State-Level Organization General Information Forms

State	*Governor's Literacy Office*	*Governor's Literacy Council/ Coalition*	*Other Gubernatorial Initiatives*	*Governor's Use of Discretionary $ for Literacy*	*Information on Nature of Problem*	*Literacy Goals*	*Standards and Quality Measures*	*Systematic Mechanisms for Workforce Literacy*	*State Legislation on Literacy*	*State-Level Coordinating Mechanism*
Alabama										■
Arizona										■
Arkansas		■	■			■	■	■	■	■
California								■	■	■
Colorado										■
Connecticut										■
Delaware						■				
District of Columbia										■
Florida		■	■			■	■		■	■
Georgia								■	■	■
Hawaii	■	■			■	■		■	■	■
Idaho								■		■
Illinois									■	
Indiana	■	■					■	■	■	■
Iowa										■
Kansas										■
Kentucky								■	■	■
Louisiana	■					■	■		■	
Maine									■	■
Maryland		■				■	■		■	■
Massachusetts	■	■		■		■	■	■	■	■
Michigan								■	■	■
Minnesota			■			■		■	■	■
Mississippi	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Missouri			■	■			■			■

Selected Aggregate Responses, by State (continued)

State	Governor's Literacy Office	Governor's Literacy Council/ Coalition	Other Gubernatorial Initiatives	Governor's Use of Discretionary $ for Literacy	Information on Nature of Problem	Literacy Goals	Standards and Quality Measures	Systematic Mechanisms for Workforce Literacy	State Legislation on Literacy	State-Level Coordinating Mechanism
Nebraska							■		■	
Nevada		■							■	■
New Hampshire									■	
New Mexico				■		■			■	■
New York		■	■				■	■	■	■
North Carolina		■							■	■
North Dakota						■	■			■
Ohio										■
Oklahoma									■	■
Oregon					■				■	■
Pennsylvania			■			■			■	■
Puerto Rico					■	■	■			
Rhode Island								■		■
South Carolina	■			■				■	■	
South Dakota										■
Tennessee										■
Texas									■	■
Utah			■			■	■			■
Virginia								■	■	■
Washington						■	■		■	■
West Virginia			■			■			■	■
Wisconsin						■		■	■	
Wyoming										■

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Literacy Initiatives, 1990.